



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/791,036

03/02/2004

Eric J. Hull

120083-136740

1261

60172

7590

05/11/2009

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
1420 FIFTH, SUITE 3010
SEATTLE, WA 98101

EXAMINER

LEE, JUSTIN YE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/11/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/791,036	Applicant(s) HULL ET AL.	
	Examiner Justin Y. Lee	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 61-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 61-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/26/09 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 73 and 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keinonen et al. (US 6,959,207 B2) in view of Tyroler (US 6,320,941 B1) and further in view of Haaramo et al. (US 2006/0211411 A1, hereinafter, Haaramo).

Consider claim 73. Keinonen et al. disclose a mobile electronic communication device (Fig. 2) comprising:

a transceiver (network transceiver 206, Fig. 2);

a touch-screen display (output/display 202, Fig. 2 and col. 4, lines 67-col. 5, line 1); and

a processor unit coupled to the transceiver and touch-screen display (cpu 208, Fig. 2).

Keinonen et al. do not disclose the processor unit is configured to cause a light unit to light a first virtual key selected from a plurality of virtual keys of the touch-screen display to indicate receipt of a message from a first source, the first source being the only one of a plurality of sources to be associated with said first virtual key, wherein the lighted first virtual key manifests an appearance of being illuminated, and cause a light unit to light a second virtual key selected from a plurality of virtual keys of the touch-screen display to indicate receipt of a message from a second sources, the second source being the only one of the plurality of sources to be associated with said second virtual key, wherein the lighted second virtual key manifesting an appearance of being illuminated.

Tyroler further disclose the processor unit is configured to cause a light unit to light a first virtual key selected from a plurality of virtual keys of the touch-screen display

Art Unit: 2617

to indicate receipt of a message from a first source, the first source being the only one of a plurality of sources to be associated with said first virtual key, wherein the lighted first virtual key manifests an appearance of being illuminated, and cause a light unit to light a second virtual key selected from a plurality of virtual keys of the touch-screen display to indicate receipt of a message from a second sources, the second source being the only one of the plurality of sources to be associated with said second virtual key, wherein the lighted second virtual key manifesting an appearance of being illuminated (col. 5, lines 8-26, a LED lights according to a source of a message is received. Each of the priority list can just having one address. For example, the user of the device only input one address for each of the priority list. So a message received from the only address will illuminate one of the LEDs associated with that address. When combined with Keinonen et al. the LEDs can be emulated on the touch-screen display 202 as virtual light sources).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Tyroler into the teachings of Keinonen et al. for the purposes of notifying the user the priority of the received messages (col. 5, lines 8-26).

Keinonen and Tyroler also disclose causing the touch-screen display to display information associated with one or more messages received from the first source and display information associated with one or more messages received from the second source. (Keinonen, col. 4, lines 50-52, displaying received information on a display and Tyroler, abstract, displaying the email message).

Keinonen and Tyroler do not disclose displaying information associated with one or more messages received from the first and second source in response to a selection by a user of the first and second virtual key.

Haaramo further discloses listening message associated with one or more messages received from the first and second source in response to a selection by a user of the first and second virtual key (Fig. 8 and paragraph 32 and 62, a message is played according to a selection of the user of a illuminated key).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to display the received information as in Keinonen and Tyroler wherein the received information is associated a selected illuminated key by a user for the purposes of ease of use and low cost to produce and maintain (paragraph 10).

Consider claim 62. The combination further disclose wherein the virtual key manifesting the appearance of being illuminated is associated with a contact, and the message is received from the associated contact (Tyroler, col. 5, lines 8-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Tyroler into the teachings of Keinonen et al. for the purposes of notifying the user the priority of the received messages (col. 5, lines 8-26).

Consider claim 63. The combination further disclose wherein the processor unit is further configured to operate the first and the second virtual keys in an alternate mode

to initiate a message operation addressed to the first source in response to the selection, by the user, of the first virtual key, and initiate a message operation addressed to the second source in response to the selection, by the user, of the second virtual key (Haaramo, Fig. 8 and paragraph 32 and 62, each of the keys in Fig. 8 can be used alternatively to retrieve messages).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to display the received information as in Keinonen and Tyroler wherein the received information is associated a selected illuminated key by a user for the purposes of ease of use and low cost to produce and maintain (paragraph 10).

4. Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keinonen et al. (US 6,959,207 B2) in view of Tyroler (US 6,320,941 B1) and Haaramo et al. (US 2006/0211411 A1, hereinafter, Haaramo) as applied to claim 73 and further in view of McLaughlin et al. (US 4,975,694).

Consider claim 61. Keinonen et al. and Tyroler and Haaramo do not disclose wherein the mobile electronic communication device is configured to receive messages of two or more types, wherein the processor unit is configured to cause the light unit to manifest a further appearance of outputting the light with modulation that depends on the received message's type.

McLaughlin et al. further disclose wherein the mobile electronic communication device is configured to receive messages of two or more types, wherein the processor

Art Unit: 2617

unit is configured to cause the light unit to manifest a further appearance of outputting the light with modulation that depends on the received message's type (col. 6, lines 9-27, different light to light up to indicate different received messages whether the message is a protect state type of message or pre-delete state type of message).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of McLaughlin et al. into the teachings of Keinonen et al. and Tyroler and Haaramo for the purposes of informing the user of a received message.

5. Claims 64-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keinonen et al. (US 6,959,207 B2) in view of Tyroler (US 6,320,941 B1) and Haaramo et al. (US 2006/0211411 A1, hereinafter, Haaramo) as applied to claim 73 and further in view of Williams et al. (US 6,753,842).

Consider claim 64. Keinonen et al. and Tyroler and Haaramo do not disclose wherein the processor unit is configured to cause the virtual key to manifest a further appearance of outputting of light with modulation that depends on an age of a message received by the mobile electronic communication device.

Williams et al. further disclose wherein the processor unit is configured to cause the virtual key to manifest a further appearance of outputting of light with modulation that depends on an age of a message received by the mobile electronic communication device (Williams et al., col. 4, lines 1-21).

Art Unit: 2617

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Williams et al. into the teachings of Keinonen et al. and Tyroler and Haaramo for the purposes of conserving battery power (col. 1, lines 35-39).

Consider claim 65. The combination further disclose wherein the manifested modulated light has a manifested color that depends on the relative age of a received message (Williams et al., column 1 lines 41-49).

Consider clam 66. The combination further disclose wherein the manifested modulated light has a manifested blinking rate that indicates a number of unread messages received from a contact (Williams et al., column 4 lines 1-21).

Consider clam 67. The combination further disclose wherein the message is a most recent message received from a contact (Williams et al., column 3 lines 23-35).

Consider clam 68. The combination further disclose wherein the message is an unread message received from the contact (Williams et al., column 4 lines 1-21).

Consider clam 69. The combination further disclose wherein the relative age is indicated using a plurality of predetermined age categories (Williams et al., column 1 lines 41-49).

Art Unit: 2617

Consider clam 70. The combination further disclose wherein each age category of the plurality of age categories is represented by a predetermined color of light manifested by the virtual light unit (Williams et al., column 3 lines 23-35).

Consider clam 71. The combination further disclose wherein each a age category of the plurality of age categories is represented by a predetermined number of light flashes within a. cycle manifested by the virtual light unit (Williams et al., column 4 lines 1-21).

6. Claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keinonen et al. (US 6,959,207 B2) in view of Tyroler (US 6,320,941 B1) and Haaramo et al. (US 2006/0211411 A1, hereinafter, Haaramo) and McLaughlin et al. (US 4,975,694) as applied to claim 61 and further in view of Williams et al. (US 6,753,842).

Consider claim 72. Keinonen et al. and Tyroler and Haaramo and McLaughlin et al. do not disclose wherein the message is a SMS message.

Williams et al. further disclose wherein the message is a SMS message (column 3 lines 23-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Williams et al. into the teachings of Keinonen et al. and Tyroler and Haaramo and McLaughlin et al. for the purposes of conserving battery power (col. 1, lines 35-39).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin Y. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-5258. The examiner can normally be reached on M - Thu 9:30 to 8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on (571)272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Justin Y Lee/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617
5/5/09

/Patrick N. Edouard/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

Application/Control Number: 10/791,036
Art Unit: 2617

Page 11